

South Dakota Department of Education

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

Approved by USDOE on June 3, 2003

Amended with Approval, Critical Elements 7.1 and 7.2
August 21, 2003

Final Information
As of August 21, 2003



U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F: State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P: State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W: State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems

| Status | State Accountability System Element | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| <u>Principle 1: All Schools</u> | | |
| P | 1.1 | Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> . |
| P | 1.2 | Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> . |
| P | 1.3 | Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> . |
| W | 1.4 | Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> . |
| W | 1.5 | Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> . |
| P | 1.6 | Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> . |
| <u>Principle 2: All Students</u> | | |
| P | 2.1 | The accountability system includes <i>all students</i> |
| P | 2.2 | The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> . |
| W | 2.3 | The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> . |
| <u>Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations</u> | | |
| P | 3.1 | Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> . |
| P | 3.2 | Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> . |
| P | 3.2a | Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> . |
| P | 3.2b | Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> . |
| P | 3.2c | Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> . |
| <u>Principle 4: Annual Decisions</u> | | |
| P | 4.1 | The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts. |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| P | 5.1 | The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> . |
| P | 5.2 | The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> . |
| P | 5.3 | The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> . |
| P | 5.4 | The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> . |
| P | 5.5 | The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used. |
| P | 5.6 | The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups. |

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| P | 6.1 | Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> . |
|---|-----|---|

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

| | | |
|---|-----|--|
| P | 7.1 | Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> . |
| P | 7.2 | Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> . |
| P | 7.3 | Additional indicators are valid and reliable. |

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| P | 8.1 | Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> . |
|---|-----|---|

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

| | | |
|---|-----|---|
| W | 9.1 | Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> . |
| W | 9.2 | Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> . |
| W | 9.3 | State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> . |

Principle 10: Participation Rate

| | | |
|---|------|--|
| P | 10.1 | Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment. |
| P | 10.2 | Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> . |

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W– Working to formulate policy

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State? | <p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). | <p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

South Dakota is committed to implementing a school and district accountability system that complies with the intent of *No Child Left Behind*, and which reflects the characteristics of this unique state. South Dakota is marked by a large majority of small schools and districts and a tradition of strong local control. We have developed ingenious and collaborative ways to ensure our children receive the mandatory education in our diverse communities. To illustrate this, we

provide a short overview of what a “school” is in South Dakota. About 31 percent of the schools enroll fewer than 200 students across all grades. Many Native American students—the largest minority subgroup in the state— may spend some months during the year enrolled in schools administered by the BIA on reservations and some months in public schools. We have attendance centers, where a building serves a few ranch or farm families miles from the “regular” school in town. We have colony schools that serve communities where English is not the primary language. We have developed strong cooperation between public and private providers of educational services in many communities.

1. School districts (LEA’s) – The accountability system shall apply to all public school districts that have a School District ID code assigned by the Department of Education (DOE).

SDCL 13:5-1 A school district is defined as any territory organized for the express purpose of operating not less than a thirteen-year school program and governed by an elected school board is defined to be a school district.

2. Schools – The accountability system shall apply to all public schools that have a School ID code assigned by the DOE. In South Dakota, “schools” are more accurately thought of as attendance centers. An attendance center is the primary location in which instruction is delivered. Schools will follow procedures to define the grade spans of elementary, middle, and high school attendances. Should school districts wish to change their current grade span definition of an attendance center, they must submit in writing the rationale for the change to the Secretary of Education.

3. Title I School/District – A school or district that receives Title I Part A funds shall be subject to the accountability provisions that apply to Title I schools and/or districts.

All public schools and districts will be accountable for the performance of student subgroups – including major racial/ethnic subgroups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and economically disadvantaged students – through the AYP determination, provided the subgroup meets the minimum group size requirement. Both Title I and non-Title I school buildings and districts will be part of the single statewide accountability system.

For accountability purposes, school buildings that have no tested grades will be linked with the school buildings into which their students feed. For example, where a kindergarten through grade two school building feeds into a grades three through six school building, the AYP determinations for the grades three through six school building will also apply to the feeder school building.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination? | <p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p> | Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination. |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Special considerations of alternative instructional institutions.

In cases in which the school building or district that serves a student's attendance area has a say in deciding to educate the student in another institution (e.g., the school building/district decided to place students with a particular disability in a school building other than the student's school of residence), the student will be counted at his/her neighborhood school building.

- a) Rural attendance centers & colony schools (Country Schools) – Each rural attendance center shall be treated as a school for accountability purposes.
- b) Alternative Schools – (Programs outside of the traditional setting whereby students receive instruction as an extension of the regular or traditional school environment.) If alternative schools are academic extensions of the public school, for accountability purposes, test scores will be mapped back to the original resident attendance center.
- c) Institutions for the blind and the deaf – These students will be tracked back to the district school for accountability purposes.
- d) Students placed by the courts in juvenile correctional institutions and private/non-profit facilities will be tracked back to the district school.

For accountability purposes, school buildings that have no tested grades will be linked with the school buildings into which their students feed. For example, where a kindergarten through grade two school building feeds into a grades three through six school building, the AYP determinations for the grades three through six school building will also apply to the feeder school building.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| 1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i> , <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics? | <p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p> | Standards do not meet the legislated requirements. |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State of South Dakota will define 4 levels of student achievement in the summer of 2003 of Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic. South Dakota is operating under a one-year timeline waiver for assessments from the U.S. Department of Education. Setting achievement level standards is part of the planned process for implementing an assessment system that fully complies with federal requirements. Having the achievement level standards set in the summer of 2003 fits within the time line waiver agreement.

Grade level content standards have been established for reading and math and approved by the State Board of Education. Definitions of achievement levels have been written through the standards performance descriptors. Cut scores for proficiency levels will be established prior to setting the AYP "Starting Point" in the summer of 2003. The Buros Institute, University of Lincoln, Nebraska, will conduct a standards setting process with the Department of Education in establishing achievement levels for reading and math, grades 3-8 and 11.

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner? | <p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p> | Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year. |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

South Dakota has invested heavily in a state-of-the-art technology-based score processing and reporting system. When fully implemented in 2002-03, the system will support timely reporting and data usage through schools and districts throughout the state. The State will use the data from the augmented Harcourt Educational Measurement following the spring 2003 testing on the State's Dakota STEP assessment. The State plans to conduct assessments annually in the spring. The testing window will be approximately three weeks. Electronic results from the assessment will be sent to School Extra, the vendor for the statewide student information system. School Extra is in the process of creating a web-based reporting system that will incorporate the State's AYP decision rule calculations. The decision rules have been established to meet all of the requirements for AYP under No Child Left Behind. Accountability results will be available on-line by August each year. This is prior to the beginning of the school year for any school in the state.

Once AYP decisions are determined relative to school performance, the web-based reporting system will allow schools to inform parents in a timely manner to make informed decisions and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

AYP status will be determined and identification of schools in school improvement will be made in order that districts and schools will be notified by August 1st each year. It is the responsibility of each individual district to report to its schools, parents, and the community.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| 1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card? | <p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p> | <p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The State of South Dakota has contracted with School Extra to provide web-based reporting that will include all of the data elements required under NCLB and assessment results.

The State maintains a statewide student information system, called SIMS Net (Student Information Management System), where student records are stored in a centralized data warehouse in Pierre. Each student has been assigned a unique identifier that matches student demographics with each assessment result, having the capacity for tracking the status and location of each student.

Harcourt assessment results will be sent electronically to the vendor for DDN Campus, School Extra, that will input the data into the system to meet the requirements for the State report card. All report card data will be accessible portals for public consumption with different levels of security access. The South Dakota state report card will be available to all stakeholders by the beginning of the 2003-2004 school years. The State will also produce a report card for every LEA (district) and every public school, using this same format. Report cards have been and will

continue to be available to the public and school districts on the Department's web site and will be sent to local newspapers. LEAs (districts) will be required to disseminate report cards to parents; local school boards are required to review results at a public meeting. Per authority granted by the South Dakota State Legislature, the Secretary of the South Dakota Dept. of Education, has established the South Dakota Report Card Policy (see Appendix A). The authority to do so is set forth in SDCL 13-3-51.

The report card will include:

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.)
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Attendance rates for elementary school students for the school as a whole and disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs? ² | <p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. | State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

South Dakota did not have a state-level school/district accountability system. It required statutory changes which were accomplished in the 2003 legislative session. DOE convened a state-representative Advisory Group on Accountability to advise on the design of the state's school/district accountability system. That Advisory Group included members of the state legislature. The new legislation mandates that all public schools will be governed under the same accountability system. The Board of Education will promulgate rules defining AYP procedures for all public schools.

Consequences and Rewards

- The state will use the school and district accountability system primarily to promote enhanced learning and teaching.
- State consequences will apply to all public districts and schools.
- Federal consequences outlined in Title I, Part A, Section 1116 will apply only to schools and districts receiving Title I funds.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| All public schools (State Requirements) | | Federal Requirements (Title I Schools) |
|--|--|--|
| All schools | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participate in state assessments 2. Report state assessment results 3. Report state accountability results, including school designation | Participate in state assessments Report state assessment results Report state accountability results, including school designation |
| Level 0 – Fail to meet one year in a row “Alert” | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Notified – some technical assistance (e.g., data retreat) from district and state 5. Develop goals and implement strategies for improvement | Notified |
| Level 1 – Fail to meet two years in a row | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Continuing technical assistance; finalize & implement school improvement plan, including focus on specific students/areas | School improvement plan Offer public school choice (transportation paid by Title I funds) |
| Level 2 – Fail to meet one additional year | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Continue implementation of school improvement plan 8. Receive School Audit and implement its binding recommendations to Secretary, with follow up as necessary (Audit team may recommend loss of accreditation.) | Supplemental services from state-approved list (paid by district) Offer public school choice |
| Level 3 – Fail to meet one additional year | | Corrective actions Offer public school choice Supplemental services from state-approved list |
| Level 4 – Fail to meet one additional year | | School restructuring plan Offer public school choice Supplemental services from state-approved list |
| Level 5 – Fail to meet one additional year | | Implement restructuring plan Offer public school choice Supplemental services from state-approved list |
| Rewards | Recognition of Distinguished Schools <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distinguished Schools will be identified using the following criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Significantly closed the achievement gap between the disaggregated groups of | Recognition of Distinguished Schools <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Distinguished Schools will be identified using the following criteria: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> e. Significantly closed the achievement gap between the disaggregated groups of |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Students with disabilities ii. Economically disadvantaged students iii. Limited English Proficient students iv. Students of various ethnicities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Met AYP for three consecutive years in both reading and math c. Have not been in School Improvement for any of the past three years d. At least 80% of the students have met the State's proficient or advanced levels of student performance. | <p>students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Students with disabilities ii. Economically disadvantaged students iii. Limited English Proficient students iv. Students of various ethnicities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f. Met AYP for three consecutive years in both reading and math g. Have not been in School Improvement for any of the past three years h. Reported all students in the grade level for the past four years i. Met the minimum of 30 students per school. j. At least 80% of the students have met the State's proficient or advanced levels of student performance. <p>2. Title I Distinguished Schools will be eligible for a grant award depending upon availability of funds.</p> |
| All public districts (State Requirements) | | Federal Requirements (Title I Districts) |
| Level 0 – Fail to meet one year in a row “Alert” | Level 0 – “Alert” – Fails to meet AYP one year. Technical assistance will be provided to make and implement a district plan if resources are available. | “Alert” – Fails to meet AYP one year. |
| Level 1 – Fail to meet two years in a row | Level 1 – “District Improvement, Level 1” – Fails to meet AYP two years in a row. District must submit | “District Improvement, Level 1” – Fails to meet AYP two years in a row. District must submit a district plan to the |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | a district plan to the Department. | Department. SEA will provide technical assistance if requested. |
| Level 2 – Fail to meet one additional year | Level 2 – “District Improvement, Level 2” – Fails to meet AYP an additional year after Level 1, for the same content area. District must implement a comprehensive curriculum aimed at addressing the reasons it failed to meet AYP. The state will establish a monitoring plan with the district. | “District Improvement, Level 2” - LEA implements school improvement plan and SEA continues technical assistance. |
| Level 3 – Fail to meet one additional year | | <p>Corrective Action – SEA continue technical assistance and Take at least one of the following corrective actions:</p> <p>(i) Defer programmatic funds or reduce administrative funds.</p> <p>(ii) Institute and fully implement a new curriculum based on State and local content and academic achievement standards, including the provision of appropriate professional development for all relevant staff that-</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(A) Is grounded in scientifically based research; and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(B) Offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students.</p> <p>(iii) Replace the LEA personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP.</p> <p>(iv) Remove particular schools from the jurisdiction of the LEA and establish alternative arrangements for</p> |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| | | <p>public governance and supervision of these schools.</p> <p>(v) Appoint a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the LEA in place of the superintendent and school board.</p> <p>(vi) Abolish or restructure the LEA.</p> <p>(vii) In conjunction with at least one other action in paragraph (c) (2) of this section——</p> <p>(A) Authorize students to transfer from a school operated by the LEA to a higher--performing public school operated by another LEA in accordance with 200.44, and</p> <p>(B) Provide to these students transportation, or the costs of transportation, to the other school consistent with 200.44(h).</p> |
| | | <p>In the case of a local educational agency that, for 2 consecutive years, has exceeded adequate yearly progress as defined in the State plan under section 1111(b)(2), the State may make rewards of the kinds described under section 1117 to the agency.</p> |
| State – Level | | |
| | <p>USDOE will provide technical assistance to the state if it does not make AYP for two consecutive years.</p> | |

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| 2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State? | <p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p> | Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

New legislation mandates that all public school children will be tested and all public school districts will be held accountable for proficiency scores on state specified content standards. The legislation also requires that all students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 in reading and math will be tested. All public school children are also included in other academic indicators.

In cases where a student has been assigned out of district and is enrolled in a school operated to serve the special needs of the student (e.g., special education or alternative programs) the student will be counted at the school level. The student will be tracked back to the school of residence.

When a student is duly-enrolled the results will be accountable at the public school where the student spends greater than 50% of their time. For accountability purposes, school buildings that have no tested grades will be linked with the school buildings into which their students feed. For example, where a kindergarten through grade two school building feeds into a grades three

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

through six school building, the AYP determinations for the grades three through six school building will also apply to the feeder school building.

DOE has implemented a system of statewide student identification that makes it possible to accurately track student information across public schools and districts in the state, and supports the inclusion of every student in the state's school and district accountability system.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| 2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions? | <p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p> | <p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

For a student’s assessment results to be included in a school’s performance, the student must have been enrolled a substantial portion of the year in a single school. For accountability purposes, a full academic year is defined as a student being continuously enrolled from October 1 to the last day of the testing window to be counted in the accountability formula. This will assure that the annual progress of a student can be attributed to a single school. With the statewide student information management system (SIMS) in place that has given each student a unique student identifier number, it is possible for the State to easily track and determine that students test in only one school.

Students who transfer to another school during the testing window and would therefore not meet the full academic year requirement at the school for which they have been enrolled, will be counted toward AYP at the district level if their transfer is within their current school district. Students who transfer from one school district to another within the state will be counted at the state level for AYP purposes.

A student enrolled in a school for the full academic year but was not identified as a student with disabilities until after Oct. 1 will be counted in the “all” group for the school and district but will not be counted in the subgroup for students with disabilities.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| 2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year? | <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p> | <p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

A student is placed in the accountability formula as follows:

- at the school level if she/he is enrolled for the full academic year, or
- at the district level if she/he has been enrolled in two or more schools operated by the district for the full academic year, or
- at the state level if she/he has been enrolled in public schools in the state but not consecutively enrolled at any one school or district.

The statewide student information management system (SIMS Net) will track student enrollment from one public school to another, and will be used to determine which students meet the definition of a full academic year.

- During testing window, all students will be required to test at their current attendance center. However, if a student moves during the testing period and has not been previously tested, the receiving school is obligated to test the student. Students who have tested at their previous attendance center and have moved to a new school, are not required to re-test.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

- Students moving into a district that do not meet the full year academic definition are required to be tested but scores will not be counted in the school/district adequate yearly progress.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|---|
| 3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year? | The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts ³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014. | State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014. State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The first and most important message is that we in South Dakota have been and will continue to be strongly committed to education, and to educating all of our students. The second message is that the small size and diverse nature of our schools and districts makes reliability a primary concern in designing and implementing a school and district accountability system. We are committed to creating a school and district accountability system that includes and is fair to all of our schools and districts, across their varied circumstances. Much of the design in the South Dakota AYP system is intended to make it possible to include districts, schools, and subgroups in a reliable and valid way.

South Dakota will include two academic content areas in its school and district accountability system: reading and mathematics. ¹ The district accountability system is exactly the same as the school accountability system. That is, the district will be treated as a single, large school, and scores will be calculated for the district exactly as they would be for a school. Operationally, decisions made for a "school" or "students in a school" will be made for a district or students in the district. The state's assessment, Dakota STEP, has been aligned to the state content standards in reading and math. The Dakota STEP assessment augments the SAT-10, published by Harcourt Educational Measurement. Although accountability will be based on reading and math, the Dakota STEP test includes language arts, science, and social studies through the SAT-10 battery. The Dakota-STEP assessment will be administered to every student enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 starting spring 2003. An Alternate Assessment is available for students whose IEPs so specify.

The Department has contracted with the Buros Institute, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, to conduct the standards-setting study on the Dakota STEP assessment for all grades following collection of actual student performance data this spring, 2003. When completed as planned, and approved by the state Board of Education, the achievement levels for grades 3-8 and 11 will be in place in time for accountability reports to be issued using 2003 data. S.T.A.A.R.S. (Statewide Team-led Alternate Assessment and Reporting System) is used in districts in all grades tested.

South Dakota will hold schools accountable for having 100% of the students reach proficiency by 2013-14. Schools will be required to show that they have at least a minimum Status score, beginning in 2002-03, which will be raised over time. The Starting Point for 2002-03 will be calculated by ranking schools in terms of the School Status Score, and denoting the School Status Score of the school enrolling the 20th percentile student in terms of overall school enrollment for 2002-03. Intermediate Goals will be established that require schools to increase their minimum performance from the Starting Point to 100% in five equal intervals, with each increase occurring no more than three years apart. South Dakota's first increase will occur in 2004-2005, then in 2007-08, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-2014. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) will be established that reflect this schedule for increasing the Intermediate Goals. Starting Points, Intermediate Goals, and AMOs will be calculated separately for two grade spans—high schools (schools that enroll students in grade 12) and elementary/middle schools. Every subgroup, school, and district in the state will be accountable for meeting the high school or elementary/middle school AMOs.

A school will be declared as having met the student performance requirements of AYP if its performance meets the AYP Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), or demonstrates substantial improvement consistent with NCLB provisions. Specifically, a school will be declared as having met the student performance requirements of AYP if it meets at least one of the following conditions:

Status

1. The school's School Status Score meets or exceeds the AMO for that year.
2. If the school's average score over the two most recent years is equal to or greater than the target AMO (including confidence intervals), or
3. If the school's observed score (including the use of a confidence interval) in the most recent year is equal to or greater than the target AMO.
4. The overall confidence interval of $p = .01$ will be applied to the available Status Score data (i.e., most recent single year or average of two years).

School Improvement (Safe Harbor)

5. If in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment

To meet AYP, a school must meet at least one of the student performance conditions specified above. In addition, the school must also meet all of the conditions below.

Participation

6. The school must have at least 95% of the students enrolled in the tested grades on the last day of the testing window participate in the state assessments. If a school has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments.

Other Academic Indicators

7. A school that includes grade 12 will be expected to meet or exceed the State's graduation rate. The graduation rate will be calculated for the state at the end of the 2002-03 school year based on the average of schools statewide. This minimum graduation rate for AYP may be increased over time. A school that does not enroll students in grade 12 shall have an average daily attendance rate that will meet or exceed the state's minimum attendance rate expectations. This will be calculated at the end of the 2002-03 school year based on district averages statewide. This minimum attendance rate for AYP may be increased in the future.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|--|
| <p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p> | <p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p> | <p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

The State will disaggregate test data for all public schools to report the progress of student subgroups and to determine whether or not each subgroup has met or exceeded the state's annual measurable objectives. South Dakota will use current census definitions for major racial/ethnic groups: White, Black, Asian/Pacific, Hispanic, and Native American. Students with free and reduced lunch status will be the basis for determining the subgroup of economically disadvantaged status. Students identified through the State's test required Limited English Proficiency will be identified for the LEP subgroup. Students qualifying for an IEP (Individualized Education Plan) will be categorized in the students with disabilities subgroup.

Each subgroup in the school must have at least 95% of the students enrolled in the tested grades on the last day of the testing window participate in the state assessments. If a subgroup has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments. If the subgroup did not meet a Student Performance condition under Status, that subgroup in the school must meet one of the conditions under Other Academic Indicators, and show improvement on that academic indicator from the previous year.

Uniform averaging procedure – To provide greater reliability, the higher of the following shall be used to determine if a school or LEA has made adequate yearly progress:

1. Data from the school year for which a determination is being made.
2. Average data from the two most recent years of student assessment.

Scores will be combined from the two most recent years and a percentage proficient calculated from that data (see Table 1 for illustration). This two-year average will be calculated separately for reading and mathematics.

In the initial year of the assessment (2003) for any school, the AYP determination will be based on a single year of data since multiple years of data is not available.

To meet the student performance requirements of AYP, a school will be counted as meeting AYP if it meets one of the following conditions including participation rate requirement and other academic indicators:

- If the school's average score over the two most recent years is equal to or greater than the target AMO (including confidence intervals), or
- If the school's observed score (including confidence intervals) in the most recent year is equal to or greater than the target AMO.

Table 1: Example of Two-Year Averaging Applied to AYP Status Decision

| Year | Percent Proficient | Number of Students Proficient | Number of Students |
|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2003 | 57% | 26 | 46 |
| 2004 | 65% | 35 | 54 |
| Total | | 61 | 100 |
| 2-year average | 61% | | |

| Year | Percent Proficient | AMO for current year | AYP Decision (Status) |
|--------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2003-04 Avg. | 61% | 63% | (Did not meet) |
| 2004 | 65% | 63% | Met |

In the example, the school's two-year average percent proficient is 61%. If the AMO were 63%, the school would not meet AYP on the basis of its two-year average, but it would meet AYP on the basis of its most-recent year (65%). This approach rewards schools and districts for efforts that result in strong single-year achievement gains and minimizes the potential for falsely inferring that a school or district has failed to meet AYP standards.

School Improvement (Safe Harbor)

If in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment

The State's statewide student information management system (SIMS Net) will track this information at the school, district, and state levels.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| <p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p> | <p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p> | <p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p> |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

South Dakota will hold schools accountable for having 100% of the students reach proficiency by 2013-14 in two academic content areas in its school and district accountability system⁴: reading and mathematics. Schools will be required to show that they have at least a minimum Status score, beginning in 2002-03, which will be raised over time. The Starting Point for 2002-03 will be calculated by ranking schools in terms of the School Status Score, and denoting the School Status Score of the school enrolling the 20th percentile student in terms of overall school enrollment for 2002-03. Starting Points, Intermediate Goals, and AMOs will be calculated separately for two grade spans—high schools (schools that enroll students in grade 12) and elementary/middle schools as well as for districts and the state. Every subgroup, school, and district in the state will be accountable for meeting the high school or elementary/middle school AMOs.

District starting point – ¹ The district accountability system is exactly the same as the school accountability system. That is, the district will be treated as a single, large school, and scores will be calculated for the district exactly as they would be for a school. For the sake of brevity, references to “school accountability” in this paper will include “district accountability” unless specifically noted otherwise. Operationally, decisions made for a “school” or “students in a school” will be made for a district or students in the district.

Due to a timeline waiver approved by USDOE, the initial AYP starting point will be determined for reading and mathematics in the summer of 2003. The State has determined the starting points for reading/math using the NCLB prescribed methodology for 2 different methods. Both methods have been calculated, and then the higher of the two used. In all cases, the higher calculation was the School Status Score of the school enrolling the 20th percentile student in terms of overall school enrollment. The following chart shows the results of the calculations for each grade span and subgroup.

⁴ The district accountability system is the same as the school accountability system, except the other academic indicator is not applied at the district level. That is, the district will be treated as a single, large school, and scores will be calculated for the district exactly as they would be for a school. For the sake of brevity, references to “school accountability” in this paper will include “district accountability” unless specifically noted otherwise. Operationally, decisions made for a “school” or “students in a school” will be made for a district or students in the district.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Starting Point Calculations: Based on 2002-2003 Data

| <u>Grouping</u> | <u>Subject</u> | <u>% Based on 20% Enrollment</u> | <u>Lowest Subgroup %</u> | <u>Sub-Group Description</u> |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| District/State | Reading | 69.4% | 28.7% | State All LEP Reading |
| District/State | Math | 52.7% | 17.0% | State All LEP Math |
| K-8 | Reading | 65.9% | 29.5% | State K-8 LEP Reading |
| K-8 | Math | 45.9% | 16.9% | State K-8 LEP Math |
| 9-12 | Reading | 50.0% | 7.5% | State 9-12 LEP Reading |
| 9-12 | Math | 60.2% | 12.9% | State 9-12 IEP Math |

The starting points for each grade span are as follows:

| <u>Grouping</u> | <u>Subject</u> | <u>Starting Points</u> |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| District/State | Reading | 69% |
| District/State | Math | 52% |
| K-8 | Reading | 65% |
| K-8 | Math | 45% |
| 9-12 | Reading | 50% |
| 9-12 | Math | 60% |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress? | <p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p> | <p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

South Dakota will hold schools accountable for having 100% of the students reach proficiency by 2013-14. Starting Points, Intermediate Goals, and AMOs will be calculated separately for two grade spans—high schools (schools that enroll students in grade 12) and elementary/middle schools. Every subgroup, school, and district in the state will be accountable for meeting the high school or elementary/middle school AMOs.

A school will be declared as having met the student performance requirements of AYP if its performance meets the AYP Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), or demonstrates substantial improvement consistent with NCLB provisions.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Annual Measurable Objectives for each grade span and subject area

| | K-8 | | 9-12 | | District/State | |
|-------------|---------|------|---------|------|----------------|------|
| School Year | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |
| 2002-2003 | 65% | 45% | 50% | 60% | 69% | 52% |
| 2003-2004 | 65% | 45% | 50% | 60% | 69% | 52% |
| 2004-2005 | 71% | 54% | 58% | 67% | 74% | 60% |
| 2005-2006 | 71% | 54% | 58% | 67% | 74% | 60% |
| 2006-2007 | 71% | 54% | 58% | 67% | 74% | 60% |
| 2007-2008 | 77% | 63% | 67% | 73% | 79% | 68% |
| 2008-2009 | 77% | 63% | 67% | 73% | 79% | 68% |
| 2009-2010 | 77% | 63% | 67% | 73% | 79% | 68% |
| 20010-2011 | 83% | 73% | 75% | 80% | 85% | 76% |
| 2011-2012 | 88% | 82% | 83% | 87% | 90% | 84% |
| 2012-2013 | 94% | 91% | 92% | 93% | 95% | 92% |
| 2013-2014 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| 3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress? | <p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. | <p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

Intermediate Goals will be established that require schools to increase their minimum performance from the Starting Point to 100% in five equal intervals, with each increase occurring no more than three years apart. South Dakota will increase the first Intermediate Goal in 2004-2005, then in 2007-08, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-2014. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) will be established that reflect this schedule for increasing the Intermediate Goals.

Intermediate Goals

| | K-8 | | 9-12 | | District/State | |
|-------------|---------|------|---------|------|----------------|------|
| School Year | Reading | Math | Reading | Math | Reading | Math |
| 2002-2003 | 65% | 45% | 50% | 60% | 69% | 52% |
| 2004-2005 | 71% | 54% | 58% | 67% | 74% | 60% |
| 2007-2008 | 77% | 63% | 67% | 73% | 79% | 68% |
| 2010-2011 | 83% | 73% | 75% | 80% | 85% | 76% |
| 2011-2012 | 88% | 82% | 83% | 87% | 90% | 84% |
| 2012-2013 | 94% | 91% | 92% | 93% | 95% | 92% |
| 2013-2014 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| 4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP? | AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁵ | AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

A school will be declared as having met the student performance requirements of AYP if its performance meets the AYP Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), or demonstrates substantial improvement consistent with NCLB provisions. The school must also meet the 95% participation requirement as well the other academic indicator.

For districts and schools who have less than ten students in the grades tested for the current year, adequate yearly progress will be determined in the following manner.

1. The percent of students proficient and advanced for the school or district for the past two years, including the most current year, will be combined. That percent will be compared to the state's annual measurable objective for the current year. If that percentage meets or exceeds the AMO, the school or district in questions will be said to have made AYP. This will be determined separately for reading and math.

2. For those schools or districts whose combined percentage of students proficient and advanced does not meet the current AMO, further analysis of school data will be conducted for reading and math separately. A desk audit conducted by the SEA will focus on additional assessment data provided by the school / district for each content area. If the audit team does not find objective evidence that adequate yearly progress has been made, the school / district will be said to have not made AYP for that particular content area. Two consecutive years of failure to make AYP in a content area will place a school / district in school improvement status.

Criteria for the desk audit is under development and will be submitted to USDOE.

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|---|
| 5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups? | Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency. Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress. | State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

All decision rules for AYP in math and reading also apply to the defined subgroups:

- US Census report definitions are used to define the major racial and ethnic groups to include White, Black, Asian/Pacific, Hispanic, and Native American.
- Students with free and reduced lunch status will be the basis for determining the subgroup of economically disadvantaged.
- Students identified through the State's required test of Limited English Proficiency will be identified for the LEP subgroup.
- Students qualifying for an IEP will be categorized under the students with disabilities subgroup.

The following table indicates the areas in which subgroups will be held accountable:

| | Reading | | Mathematics | | Other Academic Factor |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| | Performance (Status and Improvement) | Participation Rate | Performance (Status and Improvement) | Participation Rate | |
| All students | | | | | |
| Economically Disadvantaged | | | | | |
| White | | | | | |
| Black | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Native American | | | | | |
| Students with Disabilities | | | | | |
| LEP Students | | | | | |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress? | Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students. | State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The same tests that will be applied to the school as a whole will be applied to each subgroup in the school to determine if each meets AYP. An overall confidence interval will be used ($p = .01$) to increase the reliability of these tests. Using SIMS Net, we are able to match student data with test results and calculate results for all required subgroups

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State’s definition of adequate yearly progress? | <p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p> | <p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

All students with disabilities will participate in the statewide assessment program either by taking the Dakota STEP with or without accommodations or, for those students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, by participating in the South Dakota alternate assessment entitled S.T.A.A.R.S. (Statewide Team-led Alternate Assessment and Reporting System).

Test scores of students with disabilities who are assessed using the Dakota STEP will be included in the assessment data for the grade in which the student is enrolled for purposes of calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP).

A small number of students—i.e. those with the most significant cognitive disabilities-- take the S.T.A.A.R.S. alternate assessment. It is available for students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 (the grades assessed per South Dakota’s approved assessment plan) and is a functional-level assessment in the areas of language arts/reading, mathematics, science and social studies. South Dakota will hold students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who take the S.T.A.A.R.S. to grade level standards; for purposes of calculating adequate yearly progress, S.T.A.A.R.S. scores will rank in the “below proficient” achievement standard.

During the transition year, South Dakota will not hold students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed with the S.T.A.A.R.S. alternate assessment to alternate achievement standards for purposes of determining AYP. They will be held to grade level standards.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress? | <p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p> | LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

Students will be identified as limited English proficient (LEP) when they meet the criteria for LEP as established by the Federal definition for LEP and by the administration of either the IDEA Language Proficiency Test (IPT) or the Language Assessment Scales (LAS).

All students identified as LEP will participate in all statewide assessment programs with accommodations, if needed. The State will not be providing a native or first language version of any state mandated assessment instruments. An alternate assessment for LEP students will not be made available.

For LEP students who have been enrolled in their attending LEA for at least one full academic year, the results of participation in the statewide assessment program will be included in the school or district's adequate yearly progress. LEP students enrolled for less than one full academic year must participate in all statewide assessment programs. However, their test results will not be included in the LEA and school determination of adequate yearly progress.

For identified LEP students, annual assessment of a student's English language proficiency will be accomplished by the administration of the Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (SELP). The test will be administered at the same time as the Dakota STEP. Results of that assessment will be reported to the LEA and SEA by the test manufacturer and used to determine AYP status for the state. This is a requirement of Title III.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes? | <p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁶</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p> | <p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The minimum size of subgroups will be 10 for the purpose of reporting results and accountability.

Minimum Size for Reporting purposes: For reporting purposes we will employ a minimum size of 10 for all subgroups. This minimum-n will enable the state's reports to maintain individual student confidentiality, in accordance with federal FERPA privacy requirements. The state will also employ additional rules to maintain confidentiality of individual student results under special situations (e.g., all students proficient).

Minimum Size for Accountability Purposes

For AYP calculations, South Dakota will use a confidence interval combined with a minimum n of 10 for all subgroups. This will allow schools of all sizes, even very small schools, to be included in the accountability system with reasonable reliability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP? | Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. | Definition reveals personally identifiable information. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The state will maintain the privacy of students when reporting results and determining AYP by using a minimum number of 10 when reporting results, including subgroups. The state will also incorporate additional rules to safeguard privacy in situations such as when all or almost all students have the same score.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| 6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments? | <p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p> | Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

Reading and mathematics assessment scores are the predominant determinant of AYP. The state's assessment, Dakota STEP, has been aligned to the state content standards in reading and math. The Dakota STEP assessment augments the SAT-10, published by Harcourt Educational Measurement. Although accountability will be based on reading and math, the Dakota STEP test includes language arts, science, and social studies through the SAT-10 battery. The Dakota-STEP assessment will be administered to every student enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 starting spring 2003. An Alternate Assessment is available for students whose IEPs so specify.

The Department has contracted with the Buros Institute, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, to conduct the standards-setting study on the Dakota STEP assessment for all grades following collection of actual student performance data this spring, 2003. When completed as planned, and approved by the state Board of Education, the achievement levels for grades 3-8 and 11 will be in place in time for accountability reports to be issued using 2003 data.

Once performance levels have been set, Dakota STEP test data will be used to determine the percentage of students proficient and advanced at each school. This information will then be applied to decision rules in setting the starting point, annual objectives, intermediate objectives, and AYP calculations.

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| 7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate? | <p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. | State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria. |

STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS

Methodology for Calculating Graduation Rate:

The below formula will be fully implemented in four years. It is South Dakota's intention to build the database needed to calculate this rate for all subgroups over a four year period based on the following schedule. In school year 2003 include 12th grade data only; in school year 2004 include 11th and 12th grade data; in school year 2005 include 10th through 12th grade and in school year 2006 full implementation with the inclusion of data for grades 9th through 12th grades.

The formula to be utilized is as follows:

$$\frac{\text{High School Completers in Year 4}}{\text{Dropouts (Gr 9, year 1 + Gr 10, year 2 + Gr 11, year 3 + Gr 12, year 4) + HS Completers, Year 4}}$$

This proposed calculation is based on the recommendation of NCES in a publication “Public High School Dropouts and Completers from Common Core of Data: School Year 1998-99 through 1999-2000”.

This rate will be reported and utilized for purposes of determining AYP for all students (in the aggregate) and also the disaggregated subgroups.

Definition of Terms (based on NCES recommendations):

Dropout: An individual who

- Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and
- Was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and
- Has not graduated from high school or completed a state or district approved educational program; and
- Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - Transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs);
 - Temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or
 - Death.

High School Completers:

- Diploma recipients – individuals who are awarded a high school diploma. This would not include students that may receive a non-standard diploma (e.g. a GED or certificate of completion).

Students with disabilities who complete the required coursework for graduation will receive a regular high school diploma. A student on an IEP who meets these criteria will be counted as a High School Completer. However, students who are on an IEP who do not graduate in the standard number of years and who do not meet all required coursework for graduation will not be considered a High School Completer.

A school that includes grade 12 will be expected to meet or exceed the State’s graduation rate. The graduation rate will be 90%, this threshold was based on 2002-2003 data and set at one standard deviation from the statewide mean (see the below data analysis of 2002-2003 data). This minimum graduation rate for AYP may be increased over time.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| <i>Graduation Rate (2002-2003 data)</i> | |
|---|---------|
| Mean | 97.205 |
| Median | 100 |
| Mode | 100 |
| Standard Deviation | 7.60142 |
| Range | 58.3333 |
| Minimum | 41.6667 |
| Maximum | 100 |
| Sum | 16622.1 |
| Count | 171 |
| Confidence Level(95.0%) | 1.14749 |

| | | |
|----------------------|---------|------------|
| 1 Standard Deviation | 89.6036 | 90% |
|----------------------|---------|------------|

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP? | <p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁸</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p> | State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

South Dakota will use attendance rate as its additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.

Methodology for Calculation of Attendance Rate (reported as a percentage):

$$\frac{\text{Days of Attendance}}{\text{Days of Membership}}$$

This rate will be reported and utilized for purposes of determining AYP for all students (in the aggregate) and also the disaggregated groups.

A school that does not enroll students in grade 12 (elementary/middle schools) shall have an average daily attendance rate that will meet or exceed the state's minimum attendance rate expectation of 94%. This rate was calculated based on a statistical review of district attendance rate data from the 2002-2003 school year. As per the data analysis included below, a rate of 94% represents 2 standard deviations from the mean. This minimum attendance rate for AYP may be increased in the future.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| <i>District Attendance Rates (2002-2003)</i> | |
|--|------------|
| Mean | 97.0133824 |
| Median | 97.0291877 |
| Mode | 100 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.63745061 |
| Range | 10.3148139 |
| Minimum | 89.6851861 |
| Maximum | 100 |
| Sum | 16492.275 |
| Count | 170 |
| Confidence Level (95.0%) | 0.24792066 |

| | | |
|----------------------|------------|-----|
| 2 Standard Deviation | 93.7384812 | 94% |
|----------------------|------------|-----|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?</p> | <p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p> | <p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p> |
| <p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p> | | |
| <p>The State of South Dakota collects student data through SIMS Net, which has greatly enhanced the reliability of data reporting. South Dakota's graduation rate calculation complies with national standards and both the graduation and attendance rates are subject to audit and verification at the state level.</p> <p>The graduation rate calculation is consistent with the methodology recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics.</p> <p>The South Dakota Department of Education reviews data submitted by school districts relative to the graduation and attendance rates and identifies figures that represent substantial change from past performance. The South Dakota Department of Education engages individual school districts in verifying data that represents substantial change from past performance.</p> | | |

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP? | <p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.⁹</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p> | State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation will examine separately the percent of students proficient and advanced in reading and mathematics, as well as the rates of participation in reading and mathematics. In determining whether each subgroup, school building, and district, as well as the state-as-a-whole meets the annual measurable objectives, South Dakota will calculate – separately for reading and for mathematics – the percent of the tested students who achieve the proficient level or higher, examine participation rates, implement a uniform averaging procedure, and employ the safe harbor provision.

South Dakota will establish separate reading and mathematics statewide annual measurable objectives for elementary/middle, and high schools that identify a minimum percentage of students that must meet the proficient level of academic achievement. The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives will be applied to each school building and school district, as well as to each subgroup at the school building, district, and statewide levels to determine AYP status.

Two or more years of failing the AYP requirements in the same content area and the participation rate for that content assessment is the basis for identifying schools and districts for improvement. In addition, two consecutive years of making AYP in the same content area and the participation rate for that content assessment is necessary to be removed from the list of schools and districts identified for improvement.

Two consecutive years of failing to meet the other indicator will put a school or district into improvement status. Two consecutive years of making AYP in the other indicator will remove a school and district from being identified for improvement.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|---|--|
| 9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability? | <p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p> | <p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>South Dakota is very committed to including as many students, subgroups, schools, and districts as possible in a reliable and valid manner. South Dakota reviewed available literature, participated in discussions sponsored by CCSSO, NASBE, NEA, and other professional groups, held extensive discussions with its in-state Accountability Advisory Group, and drew upon work done by contracted consultants from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment. It is clear that there is a balance between validity and reliability. Accountability systems are not technically able to do everything we would like them to do—we would like to be able to make reliable and valid judgments about every district, every school, every subgroup, every student, every year, every test. However, there are limits—very real technical limits—to our ability to make those judgments accurately and fairly. The key issue is the number of students. A straightforward application of statistical sampling theory reveals that it would require hundreds of students in a subgroup—as many as 740—to make a single decision about whether a school had or had not improved sufficiently, with an acceptable likelihood of error of one in a hundred using the NCLB provisions—and NCLB requires a state to determine a maximum of 45 decisions about each school. Clearly, reliability would require setting a very large minimum number of students.</p> <p>Thus the South Dakota’s school and district accountability system has two main features to allow reliable and valid accountability decisions to be made while including as many subgroups as possible.</p> <p>First, we will use a confidence interval approach to ensure decisions are acceptably reliable. When using a statistical test, one must specify the null hypothesis and the “confidence level,” or amount of acceptable error. South Dakota’s assumption (null hypothesis) will be that the school did make AYP. South Dakota’s confidence level for the overall judgment about schools will be $p=.01$.</p> <p>Secondly, South Dakota will use a minimum-n of 10. This aligns the reporting requirements for confidentiality with the accountability requirements. However, South Dakota will test every student in grades 3-8 and 11 starting spring 2003, and will combine the results over two years, so that only extremely small schools will require a small school audit. The use of a confidence interval makes possible this low minimum-n, which is statistically a more valid way to include subgroups in the state.</p> |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|---|--|
| 9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations? | State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision. | State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |
| <p>The State will request that schools and districts examine their Dakota STEP data and analyze it for accuracy in order to validate (or challenge) the AYP decisions made by the state. In addition, the State will conduct validity analyses regarding which schools are or are not identified as meeting AYP, common characteristics, and so on, as the data becomes available.</p> <p>South Dakota's appeal process will be consistent with the requirements of NCLB with regard to submission of evidence and timelines.</p> <p>Districts and schools identified for school improvement are given an opportunity to review the assessment data (Dakota STEP). If the district or school believes that such identification for school improvement is in error for statistical or other substantive reasons, such district or school may provide evidence to the SEA to support such belief. In other words, a district or school may challenge the data and its analysis only, not the assessment or accountability system itself. If the district or school believes this identification is in error, the district must submit a letter stating such to the Department of Education. This letter must be postmarked no later than 10 days after receiving notification of school improvement status.</p> <p>Districts who submit a letter no later than 10 days after notification will be given the opportunity to discuss the school improvement status with SEA officials and will be asked to submit evidence to support their claim. A district or school will either be formally identified for school improvement or removed from school improvement status after consideration of the district's request. If no response is received by the said date, the department will formally identify the district or school for school improvement.</p> <p>Schools may appeal AYP determinations to their LEA, submit evidence and expect a final determination within the 30 day timeline prescribed by the NCLB legislation. Similarly, LEAs may appeal an AYP determination to the State, submit evidence, and expect a final determination within the 30 days prescribed by the NCLB legislation.</p> | | |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|---|
| 9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments? | <p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹⁰</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p> | <p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

If a district/school is undergoing any change with grade span or physical building, the district will submit a request to DOE to explain the reasons for the change in their status; DOE will approve or disapprove the proposed change. Students attending public schools that are in their first year of operation will be included at the school, district, and state levels in determining AYP. AYP determinations for new schools will commence with their first year of operation, at which time students attending the new school will be included at the school, district, and state levels.

When school boundaries are dramatically altered within a large school district (a district with 2 or more schools per grade span), prior AYP status for the school(s) involved will be null and void. Dramatically altered is defined to mean at least 50% of the student population of the school building – or – grade spans tested in that building has been removed and replaced with students from another school within the district. The first year of the newly restructured school will become its first AYP status. It is the responsibility of district administration to inform DOE that such changes have taken place.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

In a case where two or more districts consolidate, prior AYP status for all districts and schools involved will become null and void. The newly formed district and its schools will obtain its first AYP status based upon assessment results of its first full year of operation.

As South Dakota implements new assessments, we will adjust our definition of adequate yearly progress so that we incorporate data from the new tests while maintaining the timeline for all students to reach proficiency by 2013-14. The baseline percent proficient rate from the new assessment will be averaged with the rate from the continuing assessments to determine the intermediate goals and annual measurable objectives for the respective school level (elementary/middle, or high school grades).

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|---|--|---|
| 10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations? | <p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p> | <p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p> |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |
| <p>All students will be required by state law to take the Dakota STEP in grades 3-8 and grade 11 beginning in the spring of 2003. A minimum of 95% participation on the assessment is expected for a school to have made AYP. A 95% participation rate is calculated using 95% of the total enrollment of the population of grades eligible at the end of the testing window. A 95% participation rate will also be calculated for each subgroup. An eligible student is one that is enrolled in the school on the last day of the testing window in a grade identified for testing. If a school has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments.</p> <p>SIMS Net will be the vehicle for assuring accurate data collection of participation rate. Each student in the State has a unique identifier number that is linked to student assessment results and participation.</p> | | |

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

| CRITICAL ELEMENT | EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS |
|--|--|--|
| 10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied? | State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules. | State does not have a procedure for making this determination. |
| STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS | | |

The participation rate for each school and district, and for the state as a whole, as well as for each subgroup, will be based on the enrollment on the last day of the testing window . Subgroup, school and district participation rates will be determined by comparing the number of students with test results to the number of students enrolled on the last day of the testing window

For determining participation rate as part of the AYP calculation we will employ a minimum size of 40 for all subgroups. The federal requirement for participation – 95 percent – allows little room for extenuating circumstances when small groups of students are involved. The 95 percent participation requirements means that all students must be tested when the subgroup numbers less than 20; no more than one (1) student can miss the test when the subgroup size is between 20 and 39; and no more than two (2) students can miss the test when the subgroup size is 40. Even schools and districts that are adamant about test participation will encounter circumstances that prevent students from taking the test – for example, extended illness or injury. A minimum subgroup size of 40 provides schools with a cushion against failing the participation requirement for reasons that are beyond their control.

Appendix A
Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.